

REMARKS**Status of Claims**

The Office Action mailed November 21, 2005 has been reviewed and the comments of the Patent and Trademark Office have been considered. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-15, 18-20, 22, 24-26, and 28-33 were pending in the application. Claims 1, 14, 20, and 28 have been amended and no claims have been canceled or newly added. Therefore, claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-15, 18-20, 22, 24-26, and 28-33 are pending in the application and are resubmitted for consideration by the examiner.

This Amendment changes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier. It should be noted that claims 28 has been amended to correct a typographical error and not to substantively narrow its scope in any way.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1, 4-6, 9, 12-14, 18-20, 24-26, 29, 32, 33, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin (hereafter "IBM Bulletin") and further in view of U.S. patent application publication no. 2002/0116470 to Dyer et al. (hereafter "Dyer"). Claims 2, 15, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over IBM and Dyer, further in view of U.S. patent 6,393,442 to Cromarty et al. (hereafter "Cromarty"). Claims 8, 10, 11, 25, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over IBM and Dyer further in view of U.S. patent 6,519,571 to Guheen et al. (hereafter "Guheen"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

With respect to the pending independent claims 1, 14, and 20, as acknowledged in the office action, the IBM Bulletin does not disclose the combination of (1) automatic triggering of a propagation of a predetermined event on the node set, to a registered partner, over a global network, and (2) wherein the predetermined event is a *update* of the node set that is derived from a document previously sent by the trading partner. In order to cure this deficiency of the IBM Bulletin, the office action relies on the newly cited Dyer reference.

However, Dyer only discloses that a search is automatically triggered when a new document is added to a document distribution data storage so that refreshed search results can be automatically provided to a user who provides the data distribution system with a set of key words or combinations thereof for refreshing the search. Dyer has nothing to do automatically triggering the propagation to trading partners (over a global commerce network) of a predetermined event that is an update of a node set derived from a previously sent document from a trading partner. That is, the claimed automatic trigger is not initiated by anything the user sends or by the equivalent of adding a document to the document distribution data storage as disclosed by Dyer. In sharp contrast, the independent claims recite that an update of the node set derived from a previously sent document by the registered partner triggers the claimed propagation to the registered partner.

See, for example, paragraphs 71-72 and 74-77 in the specification with respect to support for these claimed features in the specification. These features provide the advantage that related or *registered trading partners* are *automatically* updated when any *changes* are made to a node set. See paragraph 79 for these advantages.

Neither these claimed features nor their advantages are disclosed or suggested by the applied prior art. Therefore, the office action fails to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to the independent claims as required by section 103. In this context, it should be noted that the patent office is required to find prior art that discloses the claimed invention as a whole. Finding isolated references to the disparate components that are pieced together using only the applicant's invention as a roadmap is impermissible hindsight reconstruction.

The dependent claims are also patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims on which they ultimately depend. In addition, they recite additional reasons for their patentability when considered as a whole.

Conclusion

In view of the above, applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. An early notice of the same is respectfully solicited. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account No. 19-0741 for any such fees; and applicant hereby petitions for any needed extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date March 21, 2006


FOLEY & LARDNER LLP

Customer Number: 22428

Telephone: (202) 672-5485

Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By



William T. Ellis

Registration No. 26,874

Aaron C. Chatterjee

Registration No. 41,398

Attorneys for Applicant